

CCRB INVESTIGATIVE RECOMMENDATION

Investigator: Jeffrey Mulinelli (S)	Team: Squad #7	CCRB Case #: 201707472	<input type="checkbox"/> Force	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Discourt.	<input type="checkbox"/> U.S.
			<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Abuse	<input type="checkbox"/> O.L.	<input type="checkbox"/> Injury
Incident Date(s) Tuesday, 09/12/2017 12:00 PM	Location of Incident: [REDACTED]	Precinct: 84	18 Mo. SOL 3/12/2019	EO SOL 3/12/2019	
Date/Time CV Reported Tue, 09/12/2017 12:37 PM	CV Reported At: CCRB	How CV Reported: Phone	Date/Time Received at CCRB Tue, 09/12/2017 12:37 PM		

Complainant/Victim	Type	Home Address
[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]	[REDACTED]

Subject Officer(s)	Shield	TaxID	Command
1. SGT Antonio Bove	227	932353	084 PCT
2. POM Maged Ibrahim	27154	950610	084 PCT

Officer(s)	Allegation	Investigator Recommendation
A.POM Maged Ibrahim	Abuse: Police Officer Maged Ibrahim searched the vehicle in which § 87(2)(b) was an occupant.	[REDACTED]
B.POM Maged Ibrahim	Abuse: Police Officer Maged Ibrahim searched § 87(2)(b)	[REDACTED]
C.POM Maged Ibrahim	Discourtesy: Police Officer Maged Ibrahim acted discourteously toward § 87(2)(b)	[REDACTED]
D.POM Maged Ibrahim	Abuse: Police Officer Maged Ibrahim refused to provide his name and shield number to § 87(2)(b)	[REDACTED]
E.SGT Antonio Bove	Abuse: Sergeant Antonio Bove refused to provide his name and shield number to § 87(2)(b)	[REDACTED]

Case Summary

On September 12, 2017, § 87(2)(b) filed this complaint via phone with the CCRB.

On September 12, 2017, at approximately 12:00 p.m., § 87(2)(b) parked his car in the vicinity of § 87(2)(b) in Brooklyn. § 87(2)(b) walked to a nearby store and, upon his return, crossed the street approximately half a block from the nearest crosswalk. § 87(2)(b) entered his vehicle, where he was then approached by PO Maged Ibrahim and Sgt. Antonio Bove of the 84th Precinct Anti-Crime Team. PO Ibrahim requested § 87(2)(b)'s identification, which § 87(2)(b) refused to provide. PO Ibrahim allegedly reached into § 87(2)(b)'s vehicle, grabbed § 87(2)(b)'s wallet from his hand, and searched § 87(2)(b)'s wallet without consent (**Allegations A and B**). § 87(2)(b) requested that his wallet be returned to him, and PO Ibrahim allegedly threw it into § 87(2)(b)'s lap (**Allegation C**).

PO Ibrahim and Sgt. Bove returned to their vehicle, at which point § 87(2)(b) asked that they identify themselves, but both officers allegedly refused to do so (**Allegations D and E**). § 87(2)(b) was released from the scene with a disorderly conduct summons for blocking vehicular traffic.

§ 87(2)(b) recorded video of this incident on his cell phone [01 Board Review].



201707472_20171122_1450_DM.mp4



201707472_20171122_1450A_DM.mp4

Mediation, Civil and Criminal Histories

- § 87(2)(b) declined to mediate this complaint because he wished for the officers to be disciplined.
- According to the Office of the New York City Comptroller, no Notice of Claim has been filed in regard to this incident [02 Board Review].
- § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED]

Civilian and Officer CCRB Histories

- § 87(2)(b) [REDACTED]
- This is the first CCRB complaint filed against PO Ibrahim during his six-year tenure.
- This is the first CCRB complaint filed against Sgt. Bove during his 14-year tenure.

Findings and Recommendations

Allegation A – Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Maged Ibrahim searched the vehicle in which § 87(2)(b) was an occupant.

Allegation B – Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Maged Ibrahim searched § 87(2)(b)

Allegation C – Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Maged Ibrahim acted discourteously toward § 87(2)(b)

§ 87(2)(b) testified that PO Ibrahim requested his identification twice, but he declined to provide it. § 87(2)(b) removed his wallet from his rear right pants pocket but did not provide the ID to PO Ibrahim. Following a third request for the ID, PO Ibrahim reached into § 87(2)(b)'s vehicle, grabbed the wallet from § 87(2)(b)'s right hand and removed his ID. With § 87(2)(b)'s ID in hand, PO Ibrahim continued searching through the wallet for 15 to 20 seconds, removing § 87(2)(b)'s laundry card from the same pocket as the ID and partially folding the wallet to look into the large center pocket. Additional cards within the wallet were partially removed by PO Ibrahim. PO Ibrahim ignored several of § 87(2)(b)'s requests for the ID to be returned. § 87(2)(b) began recording the incident on his cell phone, at which point PO Ibrahim placed the cards back into § 87(2)(b)'s wallet and threw the wallet into § 87(2)(b)'s lap. PO Ibrahim did not instruct § 87(2)(b) to take the wallet back, nor did § 87(2)(b) ever refuse to take it [05 Board Review].

§ 87(2)(b) provided a video which captures PO Ibrahim holding his wallet. During the first five seconds of the video, the camera is aimed at § 87(2)(b)'s driver's window rather than at either himself or PO Ibrahim. Thus, it is unclear how PO Ibrahim obtained § 87(2)(b)'s wallet. At the six second mark, PO Ibrahim is seen holding § 87(2)(b)'s open tri-fold wallet. At that same time, PO Ibrahim is holding § 87(2)(b)'s ID behind the wallet with his left index finger. Two cards appear to be partially removed from the pocket furthest from the camera. At the seven second mark, PO Ibrahim tips the wallet toward himself and appears to inspect the upper portion of it. PO Ibrahim maintains possession of the wallet through the twelve second mark. In the interim, PO Ibrahim places his left thumb against the protruding cards and appears to push a card slightly outward. § 87(2)(b) requests his wallet at the ten and twelve second marks, and PO Ibrahim appears to return it to him at the 13 second mark, though this physical exchange is not captured on camera [06 Board Review].



2017-11-22_14-45-22.mp4

PO Ibrahim testified that § 87(2)(b) refused to provide his ID several times after being informed that he was being issued a summons. § 87(2)(b) was holding his phone and appeared to be recording video during this interaction. After a few minutes, § 87(2)(b) handed his entire wallet to PO Ibrahim. PO Ibrahim denied requesting § 87(2)(b)'s entire wallet, taking it without consent, or reaching into § 87(2)(b)'s vehicle to obtain it. PO Ibrahim stated that he immediately removed the ID and did not conduct an extended search for it. He also denied removing any other objects, inadvertently or intentionally, from the wallet. Further, he stated that his sole motivation for searching the wallet was to obtain § 87(2)(b)'s ID, and that he never suspected that the wallet contained contraband. He did not remember § 87(2)(b) requesting that

the wallet be returned to him. PO Ibrahim handed the wallet back to § 87(2)(b) a “split second” after obtaining it. He denied throwing the wallet into § 87(2)(b)’s lap.

During his CCRB testimony, PO Ibrahim initially stated that he did not remember § 87(2)(b) requesting that his wallet be returned to him. Later in that same statement, but after reviewing the above-described video, PO Ibrahim maintained that § 87(2)(b) provided the wallet to him, but he acknowledged that § 87(2)(b) requested that it be returned to him. PO Ibrahim maintained possession of the wallet until he found the ID, after which he returned it to § 87(2)(b). PO Ibrahim maintained that he did not search the wallet after finding § 87(2)(b)’s ID and did not know why other cards appeared to be partially removed in the video [07 Board Review].

§ 87(2)(b), § 87(2)(g)

According to Sgt. Bove, § 87(2)(b) eventually provided his ID to PO Ibrahim. Sgt. Bove stated that he did not see whether § 87(2)(b) provided his entire wallet or his ID alone. He did not remember observing PO Ibrahim remove a wallet from § 87(2)(b)’s person, nor did he learn that PO Ibrahim removed and searched § 87(2)(b)’s wallet [08 Board Review].

§ 87(2)(b), § 87(2)(g)

§ 87(2)(b), § 87(2)(g)

Allegation D – Abuse of Authority: Police Officer Maged Ibrahim refused to provide his name and shield number to § 87(2)(b)

Allegation E – Abuse of Authority: Sergeant Antonio Bove refused to provide his name and shield number to § 87(2)(b)

§ 87(2)(b) stated that both officers returned to their vehicle after obtaining his ID. He then loudly asked them to identify themselves. Sgt. Bove was inside of the vehicle by this point, and § 87(2)(b) did not know whether he heard the request. PO Ibrahim, on the other hand, stated that he would return to § 87(2)(b) shortly but did not provide his identifying information. § 87(2)(b) repeated the request but did not receive any information in response. § 87(2)(b) called

911 and reported that individuals impersonating officers had taken his ID, but no additional officers responded. PO Ibrahim returned approximately ten minutes later and provided a summons to § 87(2)(b). He did not identify himself at that time or explain that his identifying information would be on the summons [05 Board Review].

PO Ibrahim and Sgt. Bove each testified that they verbally provided their names and shield numbers immediately upon approaching § 87(2)(b). Both officers testified that § 87(2)(b) made additional requests for their identifying information throughout the incident, and that they provided this information verbally. While PO Ibrahim was writing the summons, the officers heard a radio transmission of a job involving two individuals reportedly impersonating police officers. Both maintained that they had already provided their identifying information to § 87(2)(b) by that point. PO Ibrahim added that he provided his name and shield number to § 87(2)(b) again after delivering the summons. PO Ibrahim and Sgt. Bove both denied refusing to provide their respective names or shield numbers during this incident [07-08 Board Review].

At the 1:00 minute mark of the video, § 87(2)(b) shouts, “Can you identify yourself, sir?” as PO Ibrahim stands outside of the police vehicle. PO Ibrahim responds, “Have a seat in the car.” § 87(2)(b) repeats the request, to which PO Ibrahim responds, “I’ll be right back with you.” § 87(2)(b) then narrates that PO Ibrahim refused to identify himself, and that he was being attacked by an unidentified officer. The video ends approximately one minute later without any additional interaction between § 87(2)(b) and the officers [09 Board Review].



2017-11-22_14-48-47.mp4

The Event Information for the job stemming from § 87(2)(b)'s 911 call revealed that he reported that two males, who he believed to be impersonating police officers, had refused to identify themselves [10 Board Review].

§ 87(2)(b) provided a copy of the summons he received. PO Ibrahim's name and command assignment are legible [12 Board Review].

PO Ibrahim's memo book noted that § 87(2)(b) called 911 and reported individuals impersonating police officers after the officers identified themselves by name and command. Sgt. Bove's memo book contained a similar entry, stating that PO Ibrahim identified himself by name and command prior to the 911 call, though it made no mention of whether Sgt. Bove provided his own identifying information [11, 13 Board Review].

§ 87(2)(b), § 87(2)(g)
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

§ 87(2)(b), § 87(2)(g)

[Redacted text block]

Squad: 7

Investigator:	_____	_____	_____
	Signature	Print	Date
Squad Leader:	_____	_____	_____
	Title/Signature	Print	Date
Reviewer:	_____	_____	_____
	Title/Signature	Print	Date